

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(San Joaquin)

----

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROBERT HENRY LEGG,

Defendant and Appellant.

C079586

(Super. Ct. No. SF128450A)

Appointed counsel for defendant Robert Henry Legg asked this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Finding no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant, we will affirm the judgment.

## I

Grocery store security officer Inness Braxton saw defendant enter a grocery store on July 13, 2014, put three 30-packs of beer into a shopping cart, and leave the store without paying for the beer. Defendant fled when Braxton confronted him, but Braxton and two of the store's employees chased defendant, tackled him, and detained him until the police arrived.

The People charged defendant with petty theft with two prior convictions (Pen. Code, § 666)<sup>1</sup> and further alleged that defendant was required to register as a sex offender (§ 290) and that he served two prior prison terms (§ 667.5, subd. (b)). The criminal proceedings were suspended to determine defendant's competency, but in February 2015 defendant was found competent and the trial court reinstated the criminal proceedings pursuant to sections 1368 and 1369.

Defendant pleaded no contest to committing petty theft with priors. Consistent with the plea agreement, the trial court dismissed the prior prison term allegations, sentenced defendant to two years in state prison on the petty theft conviction, awarded 16 days of presentence credit, and ordered him to pay various fines and fees.

## II

Appointed counsel filed an opening brief setting forth the facts of the case and asking this court to review the record and determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Defendant was advised by counsel of the right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days of the date of filing the opening brief. More than 30 days elapsed and we received no communication from defendant.

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references are to the Penal Code.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to defendant.

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

---

Mauro, J.

We concur:

---

Raye, P. J.

---

Butz, J.